Romish Books

in the Church.

By the REV. D. F. SPRIGG, D.D.

ROMISH BOOKS IN THE CHURCH.

By

REV. D. F. SPRIGG, D. D.

NEW YORK:

The Protestant Episcopal Society for the Promotion of Evangelical Knowledge.

1881.

ROMISH BOOKS IN THE CHURCH.

A FEW WORDS ABOUT "PRIESTHOOD."

The trouble with Romanists and Romanizers begins with erroneous notions about "priests" and "priestly powers"; hence we shall not get rid of these falsities until we get correct views about "Sacerdotalism" —whether there be any such thing.

The Council of Trent and the Romanizers as well, make appeal to the following grant of priestly power bestowed by Christ:—"As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you. And when He had said this, He breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."—St. John, xx, 21–23. If the grant claimed is not here, it is nowhere. We shall have little difficulty in finding out whether it be here.

When words are to be interpreted, be they words of man or God, the *literal* sense must be given them, unless such sense be impossible or contradictory to other passages of the same writer. The literal sense of this verse must therefore hold good, unless impossible or contradictory. But the literal sense is impossible, and that by general consent. Hence we are forced to interpret in some other way. For consider ; if ministers of the Church can give absolution to whomsoever they please—for this is the literal meaning of the words—then they have power which they do not so much as claim, for it would be to claim power which even God does not exercise ; for He forgives sins *only upon conditions*, viz., of repentance and faith. We are absolutely forced to have recourse to some other than the literal interpretation.

Its literal sense being impossible, we are forced to seek another. But there is nothing difficult in it; it is not a hard text, requiring the ability of St. Paul to make it plain ; but so plain there is no difficulty in interpreting it.

1. First of all, the power of forgiveness is *conditional*. As God forgives sin only on con-

dition of faith and repentance, His ministers can do no more.

2. But as ministers cannot certainly know the character of persons who profess to be penitent, forgiveness can be only *declarative*, this and nothing more. When the conditions on which God offers pardon are complied with, *He* knows whether they be or not; if yea, the pardon of God is given. But as no man can know the heart of his fellow men, it is not *possible* for any minister to do but one thing; to *declare* to the man, "*If* you be truly penitent and are trusting in our Lord Jesus Christ, I assure you, by God's word, your sins are pardoned."

3. The minister does this *officially* or authoritatively. Whether the power be bestowed upon the apostles alone or upon the Church as a whole, will not alter the character of the declaration made by him. He is *authorized*, as no other man is, "to declare and pronounce to his people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins."

That this is the only true interpretation to be placed upon this grant, is evident from the Absolution in the Church Service:—"Almighty God hath given power and command-

ment to His ministers [here is the *official* power] to declare and pronounce to his people [here is the *declarative* power], being penitent [here is the *conditional* power], the absolution and remission of their sins."

That this was the view maintained by the old church writers is plain from the following, taken from Bishop Jewel's Apology:

"Moreover, that Christ's disciples did receive this authority, not that they should hear the private confessions of the people, and listen to their whisperings, as the common massing priests do everywhere nowadays, and do it so as though in that one point lay all the virtue and use of the keys; but to the end *they should go, they should teach, they should publish abroad the gospel*, and be unto the believing a sweet savor of life unto life, and unto the unbelieving and unfaithful a savor of death unto death; and that the minds of godly persons, being brought low by the remorse of their former life and errors, after they once began to look up unto the light of the gospel and believe in Christ, might be opened with the word of God, even as a door is opened with a key: contrariwise, that the wicked and willful, and such as would not believe nor return into the right way, should be left still as fast locked and shut up, and, as St. Paul saith, wax worse and worse. This take we to be the meaning of the keys, and that after this sort men's consciences be either opened or shut."

Now, if the reader will kindly turn back to the verses in St. John's Gospel we have been commenting upon, he will see it is absolutely *impossible* to make them mean more than that the power bestowed upon ministers to forgive sins being, in the nature of things, *conditional*, can be nothing more than an official declarative power. Hence private confession is unnecessary, and priestly absolution, except as declarative and conditional, a falsehood. But as there have appeared recently four little books which claim higher power for His ministers than Christ has bestowed, and are, at the same time, Roman Catholic in their tendencies, we invite the reader to brief reviews of them; so that he may be able to come to some conclusion as to what ought to be done with ministers of a Protestant Church who are introducing the errors of Romanism.

TRINITY CHURCH CATECHISM.

We begin with this as the least objectionable, and because, from the position of Trinity Church, New York, it is likely to do most harm.

This Catechism gets its name from the fact

that one of the clergy of Trinity Church, New York, composed it, and Dr. Dix, the rector, fathers it. That there is good in it, is of course. There is much piety in the Trent Catechism, or any other Roman Catechism; but the good is overcome by the evil. It is so with "Trinity Church Catechism." It is not in our power to review the whole of it; we discuss some of its teachings.

Q. "Why should we believe all that the Catholic Church teaches? A. Because God has said it, and God's word is true." Suppose a Trinity Church scholar should ask: "What *is* the Catholic Church?" The answer is given, p. 86: "The Church of Rome, the Greek Church, and the Anglican or English Church." And then the little child might say, but the Roman Church and the Eastern Church teach "Purgatory, Pardons, Worshiping and Adoration as well as of Images and of Relics, and also Invocation of Saints," which *our* Catholic Church says is a "fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God." It is plain, therefore, "all that the Catholic Church teaches" is not God's word and true. And not only

this; but "the Catholic Church" teaches one thing in one place and another in another. We must bring "Catholic Church" and its teaching to the scrutiny of the Bible.

Q. "Where do we find what the Catholic Church teaches? A. Chiefly in the Apostles' Creed."

But the Eastern Church knows no more of this creed than the Protestant Episcopal Church knows of the creed of Eusebius. We know there is such a creed, and the Easterns know there is a so-called Apostles' Creed; but it acknowledges it not. Hence this is a poor answer as to where we find *chiefly* what the Catholic Church teaches.

Q. "But do not some Christians make light of the creed of the Church? A. Yes; just as some children dishonor their parents." Now, if mention can be made of any Christians in the world that make light of this creed, we would like to know who they are; for we have never heard of them.

Q. "Yet do not these very persons owe what truth they have to the Church? A. Yes; they owe all their right views of God and Christ to the Church." We are not of those who make light of Church teaching; it is

most important. But the Catechism is mistaken. *We* have not gotten all our right views of God and Christ from the Church; but many from studying God's word. The Homily on "Reading of Holy Scripture" says: "Whosoever giveth his mind to *Holy Scripture* with diligent study and burning desire, it cannot be, saith St. John Chrysostom, that he should be left without help. For either God will send him some godly doctor to teach him . . . or else, if we lack a learned man to instruct and teach us, yet God Himself from above will give light unto our minds and teach us those things which are necessary for us and wherein we be ignorant." Dr. Dix will see, therefore, the Homliy sends us not to the Church, but to the Holy Scriptures of God, with God Himself for teacher.

Q. "Why do you believe in the creed? A. Because the creed is taught me by the Catholic Church." But *we* do not believe in the creed for this reason; and the Church of which Dr. Dix is minister does not believe it for this reason; but as she says in Article 8: "The creeds ought thoroughly to be received and believed, *for they may be proved*

by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." It is evident, therefore, that Trinity Church Catechism teaches one thing about the Church, and the Catholic Church, as represented by the Church of England, teaches another.

Q. "Why is this mystery [*i. e.*, redemption] so called? A. Because Christ *bought us back from the devil* with the price of His precious blood." Every theologian is aware this is one of the curious notions maintained by most of the early theologians, from the second up to the twelfth centuries. Abelard said: "All the doctors from the apostles' time agreed in this." And yet it is a false doctrine, and after the twelfth century was gradually given up; and we were not aware that any human being was so foolish as to hold this absurd and unscriptural notion until we got hold of this Catechism! And this foolish theory is taught the children of Trinity Church parish!

Q. "Did Christ's priesthood then end with His death? A. No; He himself in heaven and the Christian priest in his stead on earth, offer to the Father continually the memorial of that one sacrifice. Q. Is the work of the

priests in the Church on earth joined with our High Priest's work in heaven? A. Yes; Christ in heaven is doing in glory what His priests on earth are doing in mystery." It is difficult even for a trained theologian to know what this means; but as there is no "priesthood" as distinguished from "presbyterhood" in the Christian Church, the less children are taught about it the better. And it would be well if these scholars were asked: Q. Are Christian ministers ever called *priests* in the New Testament? A. Never; they are called Apostles, Bishops, Elders or Presbyters, Deacons, Ministers; but never Priests, and therefore I will not call them so, unless meaning the same as Presbyters or Elders.

Q. "Who was the mother of Jesus Christ? A. The ever-virgin Mary. Q. What title does the Church give her? A. The mother of God." But where does *our* Church give this title to her? Nor does the title given her by the Council, *Deipara*, mean "mother of God." Nor is it a doctrine of the *Church*, that the Virgin Mary is the "*ever*-virgin." And why children should be taught these things we know not; unless it be little by little to bring in the *worship* of the Virgin Mary, as in the Church of Rome.

Q. "How then can we honor Christ's ascension? A. 1. By setting our affections on things above. 2. By coming to God by Christ in His sacraments." But suppose we come to God by Christ in prayer? Suppose we come in any act so it is by faith; what would that be? Why should sacraments be mentioned as if they were the *only* way of coming to God by Christ?

Q. "Is there any sure way to salvation out of the Church? A. There is not." The Church being as before Roman, Eastern, Anglican, then the children are taught that salvation is surer to them in the Church of Rome, which is part of the Church, than in the Presbyterian Church, suppose, which is not part of the Church! And the Church of Rome is that Church our Reformers came out of, because death was in it! Now you are safe in it, according to this Catechism.

Q. "Can we do anything to show our love for the dead in Christ? A. Yes (among other reasons); we may pray for them." So the little children are taught "prayers for the dead."

Q. "What do you mean by believing in the forgiveness of sins? A. I believe that in the Church I can get my sins forgiven." But can we not get sins forgiven *out* of the Church and then enter this divinely appointed society?

Q. "How is the precious blood applied to the soul in the Church? A. First in holy baptism; afterwards in the other holy ordinances." Here is justification by sacraments, when Art. 11 says: "We are justified by faith *only*."

Q. "Can even deadly sin be put away? A. Yes; Christ has left power to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him." But suppose the Church does not absolve him; suppose a man who never asked the Church to absolve him; what will he get? But this question is asked in order to bring in auricular confession. The questions on page 33 show this: Q. "What is confession? How should we prepare for confession? By whom is God pleased to forgive sins in the Church? A. By the priests of the Church." But no priest of the Church has ever forgiven *our* sins; where do *we* stand, that care nothing for his forgiveness?

Q. "Why did God the Son take our flesh? A. So that His flesh might be the instrument of our salvation. Q. Is His flesh still the instrument of our salvation? A. It is, through the sacraments." This contradicts the words of Christ, who said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that *believeth* on Me hath everlasting life." The sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel teaches that believing in Christ and eating His flesh, are words of same meaning.

Q. "How are the two parts of the sacrament connected? A. That is a deep mystery; God alone knows how." But the Church teaches, as any one can see for himself who reads Articles 25, 26, 28 and 29, that *faith* is the means by which the grace of the sacraments is connected with their reception. Nor is it *possible* to be in any other way, unless we believe *opus operatum;* which are only other words for *fetishism.*

Q. "Are other sacramental rites ordained in the Church? A. Yes; *e. g.*, confirmation, holy orders, absolution, holy matrimony." But Dr. Dix has left out one of the seven—"extreme unction." He must put this in his list, or he will not have the mystic num-

ber. But of these sacramental rites the Church teaches "they are not to be counted for sacraments of the gospel."

As regards the two sacraments of the gospel, there are so many errors taught in this Catechism, that we have no space to speak of them; the teaching being about the same as that of the Church of Rome. So we pass on. Q. "What is the special office of a priest? A. To celebrate the holy eucharist and to absolve penitents. Q. What is absolution? A. A means whereby the sins we commit after baptism are put away." This is the same doctrine that is taught by the Church of Rome. But what is to become of *us* who have no absolution from the priest and who care nothing for it? We leave this to be answered by Dr. Dix, or by any other man who thinks it worth while to reflect upon it.

The children are taught the seven corporal and the seven spiritual works of mercy, of which, *in this shape*, our Church knows nothing. Q. "Are we bound to obey the commandments of the Church? A. Yes." But does Trinity Church obey canon 22, title i.? The Catechism tells there are six commandments of the Church; the first is,

"We must live by the Bible and Prayer-book; and the sixth, "Not to marry during Advent and Lent." Suppose the catechumen were to ask, Where are these commandments of the Church printed? what would Dr. Dix say? The "Church" is the Catholic Church; where has the Catholic Church, which is the Roman, the Eastern and the Anglican, taught "we must live by the Bible and Prayer-book"? Then the "seven deadly sins" and the "seven capital virtues" as they are printed in the Roman catechisms. Then another question and answer—"How do we stay in the fellowship of the apostles? A. By staying in the fellowship of the bishops, their successors." So that the child is taught, if he stays in the *Roman* Church he is in fellowship with the apostles!

Such is some of the Roman teaching of this Catechism; but when we come to its teaching about "justification," it teaches Romanism, and Unitarianism, and Naturalism for these; all agree in this: Q. "What then is justification? A. Justification is making us holy, like Christ." We cannot go into this subject in full. But in teaching the doctrine of justification through righteousness *within*

us, it contradicts God's holy word, contradicts the Episcopal Church, and brings in nothing but despair.

For suppose catechumen were to ask Dr. Dix, Are *you* holy like Christ? What answer? No one is holy like Christ; the holiness of none of God's saints can stand His scrutiny; and if justification is by *goodness*, Dr. Dix is lost beyond all hope. Thank God, Dr. Dix and all sinners like him can be pardoned by being justified not by righteousness within us, but by righteousness without us; even by "faith in Jesus Christ." *This* is justification, as Art. 11 says: "Justified by faith *only*." But we quote the solemn words of one of our greatest theologians, Master Richard Hooker; for the teaching of this Catechism is the same as that he calls the "Mystery of the man of sin," or the teaching of the Church of Rome:

"Grace is applied unto infants through baptism, without either faith or works, and in them it really taketh away original sin, and the punishment due unto it; it is applied unto infidels (*i. e.*, heathen) and wicked men in their first justification through baptism without works, yet not without faith; and it taketh

away both sin actual and original, together with all, whatsoever punishment, eternal or temporal, thereby deserved. Unto such as have attained the first justification, that is to say, the first receipt of grace, it is applied further by good works to the increase of former grace, which is the second justification. If they work more and more, grace doth more and more increase, and they are more and more justified. To such as have diminished it by venial sins, it is applied by Holy Water, Ave Marias, Crossings, Papal Salutations, and such like, which serve for reparations of grace decayed. To such as have lost it by mortal sin, it is applied by the sacrament (as they term it) of penance; which sacrament hath force to confer grace anew, yet in such sort, that being so conferred, it hath not altogether so much power as at the first. For it only cleanseth out the stain or guilt of sin committed, and changeth the punishment eternal into a temporal, satisfactory punishment, here, if time do serve, if not, hereafter to be endured, except it be lightened by masses, works of charity, pilgrimages, fasts and such like; or else shortened by pardon for term, or by plenary pardon

quite removed and taken away. This the mystery of the man of sin. This the maze the Church of Rome doth cause her followers to tread when they ask her the way to justification. . . . You see, therefore, that the Church of Rome, in teaching justification by *inherent* grace, doth pervert the truth of Christ."

By teaching that justification "is making us holy," instead of teaching "we are justified by faith only," this Catechism is "perverting the truth of Christ," and that according to Hooker.

DR. McKIM ON DR. DIX'S ORTHODOXY.

DR. DIX'S CATECHISM VS. THE PRAYER BOOK.

NEW YORK, March 28th, 1881.

To the Editors of the New York Observer:

Gentlemen: I ask the liberty, in justice to the Church of which I am a humble minister, to raise the question whether the "Trinity Catechism" fairly represents the orthodoxy of the Protestant Episcopal Church?

Regard for the eminent position, as well as the character and attainments of its distinguished sponsor (Dr. Dix), might make one hesitate to call in question the orthodoxy of a document issuing from such a source. But "individual considerations," as Dr. Dix justly and forcibly remarks in his letter to you, "are of small importance compared with those which bear on the question of the orthodoxy of our Church as a whole." I shall take this principle as a guide in the observations I have to make in this letter.

Now, the Prayer Book is the standard of orthodoxy in the Episcopal Church, and measured by this, I affirm that the Catechism in question is in many points distinctly heterodox. My space will permit me to indicate only one or two.

1. The Trinity Catechism encourages *Prayers for the Dead* (p. 30). But the Prayer Book nowhere sanctions this practice. Furnishing prayers for a vast variety of objects, it yet gives not one prayer, nor one part of a prayer, for the dead. Further, whereas the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. (A. D. 1549) contained prayers for the dead, both in the Communion Office and in the Office for Burial, they were *stricken out* in the second Book (1552); and though the Prayer Book has since undergone several revisions, *they have never been restored.* All that remains is a *thanksgiving* for the good example of the dead in Christ, and a prayer that we may have our perfect consummation and bliss "*with them.*" How far this is from being intended to encourage us to pray for them, one may judge from the fact that this form was suggested by that stout Protestant, Martin Bucer.

This being the state of the case, Messrs. Editors, even so humble a person as your present correspondent, discarding "individual considerations," and having regard for the honor and "orthodoxy of our Church as a whole," may venture to say of this Catechism, that it is not orthodox in this point. Adopting Dr. Dix's phrase, I say of our Church: "Her Prayer Book is sufficient answer to the charge, if it be made, that she favors" praying for the dead. It is for *you*, gentlemen, to consider whether

there is any logical connection between Dr. Dix's doctrine on this head and the doctrine of Purgatory; and, if so, to reconcile his doctrine of future punishment with Protestant orthodoxy.

2. This Catechism teaches (p. 19) that *Justification is the "making us holy,"* whereas the Prayer Book teaches that it is the "*accounting us holy;*" and in this respect it encourages the view of the Church of Rome rather than that of the Church of England. (See Hooker's sermon on Justification.)

Moreover, while the Prayer Book teaches that "we are justified by faith only" (Article IX.), I fail to find any reference to such a doctrine in the Trinity Catechism.

3. This Manual also teaches a doctrine of *priestly absolution*, which is unknown to the Prayer Book. On page 32 we read:

Q. Can even deadly sin be put away?
A. Yes; Christ has left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him.
Q. What are the parts of Repentance?
A. Contrition, Confession and *Satisfaction.*
Q. What is Satisfaction?
A. The making amends, if possible, and *submitting to such punishment as may be laid on us.*

What is this but the doctrine of penance, "laid upon us" by the priest, of course? Again:

Q. By whom is God pleased to forgive sin?
A. By the priests of the Church.

Now, this teaching naturally and logically leads to *auricular confession*, and that not merely as a resort in certain cases, but as a thing practically indispensable, for this Catechism contains no hint that "absolution and remission of sins" can be obtained in any other way than by the mediation of the priest. But our Prayer Book

neither enjoins nor allows auricular confession and private absolution, except the *conditional* absolution of the sick. The first Prayer Book of Edward VI. (A. D. 1549) did allow it, but in the second Book (1552) this permission was withdrawn, nor has it ever been again introduced into the Prayer Book. The people are exhorted to "confess themselves to Almighty God," and so to seek a quiet conscience. But if any one cannot thus obtain peace, and "requireth further comfort or counsel," then, in that case, he is exhorted to come to some "minister of God's Word" (not "priest of God's sacraments") that he may receive—what? Absolution? No, but "such godly counsel and advice as may tend to the quieting of his conscience." Again, therefore, I affirm of our Church: "Her Prayer Book is the sufficient answer to the charge, if it be made," that she favors auricular confession, or the doctrine of priestly absolution as taught by this "Trinity Catechism."

4. Finally this Manual teaches a doctrine of *the real presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Elements*, which is not taught in our Prayer Book, but which it was one of the chief aims of the English Reformation to abolish.

On p. 49 of the Trinity Catechism we find:

Q. To whom is the Eucharistic Sacrifice offered?
A. To God the Father Almighty.
Q. What is offered to God in the Eucharistic Sacrifice?
A. First, Bread and Wine; afterwards the Body and Blood of Christ, under the form of Bread and Wine.

This language plainly asserts a transformation or transubstantiation of the Bread and Wine; for that which is "first" mere Bread and Wine becomes "*afterwards*" "the Body and Blood of Christ, under the form of Bread and Wine." Again on p. 50:

Q. Why is it so called?
A. Because by it Christ *communicates* Himself to us, under the form of Bread and Wine.

Now, touching this doctrine, observe that while this Catechism defines the Holy Communion as "a sacrifice" "made on an Altar," *the word Altar does not once occur* in the entire Office for the Holy Communion. Why? Because it was expunged from the service at the Reformation, when the Altars themselves were ordered to be removed and replaced by "honest tables."

Observe also that neither in the Articles, Catechism or Communion Office is the Lord's Supper once called a Sacrifice, but a "memory of that His precious death and sacrifice," and that the only sacrifice which priest or people are here taught to make is "the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." Observe yet further that there is no authority whatever in the formularies of the Episcopal Church for the assertion that Christ "communicates Himself to us *under the form of Bread and Wine.*" They *do* teach that the faithful recipients are "made partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ," but these are "spiritually taken and received," "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner;" and "the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith" (Art. 28). Whereas, if we receive the Body and Blood of Christ "under the form of Bread and Wine," then are they not "spiritually" but *carnally* received and eaten, and the "mean" in that case is not "faith," but the *hand* and the *mouth*.

Dr. Dix refers us, however, to the Notice at the end of the first Book of Homilies, where the phrase objected to is used. But this notice is a mere *advertisement*, has no authority whatever, and forms no part of the Book of Homilies. It may be quoted to show the complexion of the doctrine of the divines of 1547, when it was issued,

but not as authoritative in any sense. And if we turn to the Homily on the Lord's Supper, we find not a confirmation of, but a caution against, the doctrine of this Trinity Catechism—*e. g.*, "We must take heed lest of the Memory it be made a Sacrifice." We also find the communicant exhorted not to come to the priest to apply Christ's merits to him, but to "*apply Christ's merits unto himself.*" "Herein thou needest no other man's help, no other sacrifice or oblation, no sacrificing priest." And then follows this exhortation to the communicant: "Receive it [the Body and Blood of Christ] with the hand of thy heart, and take it freely with thy inward man."

Once more, then, I beg leave to say, on behalf of the Episcopal Church, "her Prayer Book is the sufficient answer to the charge, if it be made, that she favors" the doctrine of Dr. Dix respecting the Lord's Supper.

These, Messrs. Editors, are some of the "erroneous and strange doctrines" to which Dr. Dix has given the sanction of his name. *The teaching of this Manual is modeled on the Prayer Book of* 1549, *and not on the Prayer Book as it is; this Dr. Dix will not deny.* If, then, he draws criticism upon himself, is there not a cause? And is it exactly the case of being "wounded in the house of one's friends," as he claims in his recent letter in your columns? If a man goes to work to *undermine* "the house of his friends," can he expect the sympathy of the public when the occupants of the house remonstrate against his conduct, even though he honestly believes that he is "doing God service" thereby, and really thinks it would be better for the inmates to have their house rebuilt without any of the "untempered mortar" of Protestantism?

I am, very respectfully and truly yours,

RANDOLPH H. MCKIM.

DR. EWER'S "GRAMMAR OF THEOLOGY."

The author of this book is known as the Protestant clergyman (so called) who wrote "The Failure of Protestantism." It is no wonder, therefore, he does not protest against the errors our Church does; and that he should be far nearer Romanism than Protestantism. Dr. Ewer is a theologian saturated with Romanism. He has been a student of Romish books, as will appear directly. His very terminology is Romish. Any one who reads his "Grammar" can see he has been studying Romish books to an extent, that not only has changed his theology, but his terminology. He calls the Lord's Prayer "Paternoster," as the Church of Rome does; he uses the words "supernatural grace," as Romanists do; he divides sin, as do Romanists, into "mortal and venial"; he divides "the virtues," as they do; "the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost," and the "twelve fruits" thereof are the same as in the Roman Catechisms; "the seven corporal works of mercy," "the seven spiritual works of mercy," "the precepts of the Church," are the same as in the various Catechisms edited by Ro-

man priests; the Holy Communion is "the holy sacrifice," as in the Church of Rome; "baptism by women" is enjoined as in the Church of Rome; certain sacraments give "character," some do not, as in the Church of Rome; certain sacraments are for the dead, others for the living, as in the Church of Rome; *opus operatum* is taught, as in the Church of Rome; baptism wipes out sin entirely, as in the Church of Rome; we have "supersubstantial bread in the eucharist," as in the Church of Rome; "chastity" (by which he does not mean "chastity" but the unmarried life); "more than other moral virtue renders us holy and likens us to the angels," as in the Church of Rome; for growth in "perfection," we are advised to seek out "a wise and prudent spiritual director," as in the Church of Rome; "confession to the priest" is made as imperative as in the Church of Rome; strange Latin-English words are used, as "longanimity," for long-suffering, as in the [English-speaking] Church of Rome; Dr. Ewer quotes from "The Trent Catechism" in such a way as to prove he has been a diligent student thereof:

WHAT DR. EWER SAYS: pp. 140–141.

"As by the grace of baptism we are begotten to newness of life, so by the special grace of confirmation we grow to full maturity. It perfects, therefore, the grace of holy baptism. The same difference which exists in the natural order, between birth and growth, exists also in the supernatural order, between holy baptism which regenerates, and holy confirmation which imparts perfect spiritual strength. As we have need for the grace of holy baptism, to stamp upon the soul the impress of the true faith; so it is of the utmost advantage that a new grace fortify us with such intrepidity of soul, that no danger, no dread of pains, tortures, or death even have power to deter us from the profession of the true faith."

WHAT TRENT CATECHISM SAYS BALT. ED., pp. 138–9.

"As by the grace of baptism we are begotten to newness of life, and by that of confirmation grow to full maturity, 'having put away the things of a child,' we can hence sufficiently comprehend that the same difference which exists in the natural order between birth and growth, exists also in the supernatural, between baptism which regenerates, and confirmation which imparts full growth and perfect spiritual strength.

"Again, if the new difficulties which the soul has to encounter, demand the aid of a new and distinct sacrament, it is obvious that as we have occasion for the grace of baptism to stamp upon the soul the impress of the true faith, so it is of the utmost advantage that a new grace fortify us with such intrepidity of soul that no danger, no dread of pains, tortures, death, have power to deter us from the profession of the true faith."

Here, then, is a quotation from the Trent Catechism (but no reference given; Dr. Ewer had no intention of letting it be known out of what book he took his theology) by which

he teaches the youth of *this* Church. His *Grammar* is published to be a "manual of churchmanship" for the youth of our Protestant Church, but which not only teaches the blankest Romanism; which uses Roman terminology; and which quotes from "The Catechism of the Council of Trent," in order to teach the youth of our Church! Such is this book; such the teaching of a man who solemnly promised to hold nothing contrary to the doctrine of "The Protestant Episcopal Church."

But does not Dr. Ewer speak, on p. 94, of sundry Roman errors? He does; but so did Dr. Newman, who is now a cardinal in the Church of Rome. And so did other "Tract" writers. The Church of Rome was called by them a "lost Church"; its system was styled "the papal apostacy"; "to have bound itself by a perpetual covenant to the cause of anti-Christ"; its doctrines were condemned as "profane," "impious," "blasphemous," "gross," "monstrous," "cruel." These expressions served their purpose. So when Dr. Newman went over to the Church of Rome, he confessed that he had been guilty of hypocrisy. Here is his language explain-

ing that in making these strong denunciations he said to himself, "I am not speaking my own words; I am but following almost a consensus of the divines of my Church. They have ever used the strongest language against Rome, even the most able and learned of them. I wish to throw myself into their system. While I say what they say, I am safe. Such views, too, *are necessary for our position.*" Such the position of the leader of the old Tractarians; such his deceitfulness, as confessed by himself. Now what is there in any other man who teaches essential Romanism, to make us believe he is opposed to Rome, when he speaks of *some* Romish errors? It may be with Dr. Ewer, as with Newman, "*necessary for his position.*" We do not say it is so, it *may* be so; for he is essentially a Romanist.

And how did Dr. Pusey regard this defection of Dr. Newman? Was he horrified that a man should be a hypocrite, and leave the true doctrine of Christ to run after the teaching of Rome? Dr. Pusey pronounced his perversion "a judgment" on the Anglican Church for not valuing him sufficiently, and took comfort that he was "not so much gone

from us, as transplanted into another part of the vineyard"; expressing at the same time an earnest hope that the vineyard might soon be completely one; "since," as he went on to say, "it is heresy existing more or less in us which keeps Rome from acknowledging us." It is evident, therefore, when a member of the Church *protesting* against Rome, holds at the very time all its essential errors, he cannot throw dust in our eyes by speaking of *some* things in which Rome is in error.

Before we speak of the teaching of this "Grammar," a word or two. Among the errors of Rome, which Dr. Ewer speaks of, is: "you cannot trust any quotation from an early father in any popular Roman controversial book." We will suppose this to be true. But these are the men who have the "true Church" and the "true sacraments" by which men grow holier, and without which they cannot partake of the grace of Christ. *They* have these, while "the sects" have them not. But as we can depend upon the quotations of the "sectarians," what is it which makes them so much better than those who alone have the grace by which to become Christian? What is the use of sacra-

ments which work *opere operato*, and yet permit those who receive them to be such a lot of rascals? Their controversialists must be among their leaders. If the leaders cannot be depended upon, what for the rank and file? If we were asked whether we believe that these controversialists were all liars, we would say no. But it has happened to them as to the Jews of old; having been false to the truth of God as were the Jews, God has blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts. A solemn matter this; nothing more so in the history of any human soul. And when we have placed some of Dr. Ewer's quotations alongside the books he has quoted from, it will be seen that *he* cannot be depended upon, when he makes his quotations. Take the following from the "Grammar":

"But we are to note that she [*our* Church] is careful not to say in the Catechism that there are *only two* sacraments. What she says is, that there are 'two only that are generally necessary to salvation.' In her Homilies she teaches that 'the name sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby an holy thing (or inward grace) is *sign*-ified'; and she goes on to speak of 'the *other five* commonly used for supplying the number of the seven sacraments.'"

Will the reader have the kindness to cast his eye over the above again, until he gets the idea which Dr. Ewer wishes to teach? When he has done this, we will permit him to read what the Homily does teach, and then he will have clear notion of the manner in which Dr. Ewer quotes. "The name of a sacrament may be attributed to anything whereby an holy thing is signified. In which understanding of the word the ancient writers have given this name, not only to the other five, commonly *of late years* taken and used for supplying the number of the seven sacraments, but also to divers and sundry other sacrament ceremonies, as to oil, washing of feet, and such like; not meaning thereby to repute them as sacraments, in the same signification that the two forenamed sacraments are." The Church condemns the five sacraments; Dr. Ewer approves of them. Dr. Ewer teaches one thing from his garbled quotation from the Homilies, and the Homilies another. We have another specimen of his manner of quoting:

"*Holy Absolution.*—The outward sign is the words of the priest, 'I absolve thee,' and (where the words of the Homily in reference

to the matter are carried out) the laying on of the priest's hands as he absolves."

Now let us read what the Homily says: "For though absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin, yet by the express word of the New Testament it hath *not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign*, which is the imposition of hands."

DR. EWER'S VIEWS OF SACRAMENTS SAME AS THOSE OF ROME.

It was a disputed point among Romanists even at the Council of Trent, as to the manner in which grace was in the sacraments; so the Council did not decide, but that sacraments worked *opere operato*, there was no dispute; but this view is condemned by our Church in the twenty-fifth Article, which says they have wholesome effect only in those who partake worthily; and "partaking worthily" is defined in other Articles as partaking "by faith." But the very grossest view is taken in this "Grammar"; the sacraments of Christ being turned into fetish, as the following extract will prove:

"If I should place a certain amount of gold which I wish to give to a friend in a purse,

when I hand him the purse I should enrich him with the gold contained in the purse. So God, wishing to give to a soul certain graces (or spiritually golden gifts) places each gift in a certain outward form, he receives from God the inward gifts, which the outward and visible form, so to speak, contains. This will give you to understand what a sacrament is."

This is the baldest and falsest statement of the grace of the sacraments we have seen of late years, being the same as that held by the *Dominicans;* that grace is in the sacraments "as water is in a vessel"; here it is "as money in a purse."

When the "Grammar" speaks of the inward grace of the holy communion, it puts it in Romish language, omitting the essential words our Church has given, saying: "The inward and invisible gift is the body and blood of Our Lord." But the Church adds "which are *spiritually* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

The Grammar gives lists of *seven* sacraments. which it calls the two great sacraments and the five lesser sacraments; these being as follows: Holy confirmation, holy absolution, holy unction, holy orders, and

holy matrimony. Everybody knows that in the old theologians, there are not only seven but more than seventeen sacraments. But whether seven or seventeen, our Church says they are "not to be counted as sacraments of the Gospel." Dr. Ewer says they are, contradicting the Church.

The "Grammar" gives the outward signs of each of the seven sacraments, except when it comes to matrimony it forgets; but the outward sign of holy unction is "the oil of the sick," that has been blessed, and the words used by the priest as he anoints the sick person. The inward grace is the forgiveness of sins and the raising of the sick man, if not to bodily, at least to "spiritual strength." Here is a sacrament of which our Church knows nothing, but which the Church of Rome knows all about; thus proving Dr. Ewer is more of a Romanist than he is a true son of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

There is no difference between the teaching of the "Grammar" and the Church of Rome as regards baptism, save that it is really grosser than some of the more devout Romanists teach. "The sacrament of baptism is, then, the first sacrament of absolution in the Church. It accomplishes the entire wiping out of all previous sin from the book of life."

DR. EWER'S LISTS OF SINS SAME AS IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

The "Grammar" gives the lists of sins as they are found in any Roman Catechism. We have *mortal* sins defined as do the Romish Catechisms and *venial* sins; the lists of deadly sins Dr. Ewer has taken from Roman Catholic books. But it will hardly be believed that the author has the audacity to say that our Church has made this distinction—"See the first deprecation in the litany, remember not, etc., where the Church makes distinction between sins and offenses, by the former meaning mortal and by the latter venial sins. See also in the warning, where she speaks of mortal sins as grievous sins."

SACRAMENT OF ABSOLUTION.

The teaching of this book on the subject of absolution is precisely the same as that of the Church of Rome. We are aware that the "Grammar" says, "The sacrament of

absolution is not binding upon the Christian." But while it *says* this, it takes care to teach there is little if any hope of forgiveness without it. Read the following: "The sacrament of baptism is the first sacrament of absolution. But for an equally assured remission of those sins that we commit after baptism, one of two things is necessary; namely, either perfect contrition or absolution. It was mercifully vouchsafed by God, authoritatively to assure those souls, who, though they be tearfully contrite and heartily resolved to amend, are yet reluctant to go so far as to feel sure that their contrition is absolutely a perfect contrition, that their sins are indeed wiped from the book of life. In the sacrament of absolution this, their imperfect contrition, is accepted as though it were perfect, and, in accordance with the solemn asseveration and commission of Christ to His priests," etc. But this doctrine is that of the Trent Catechism, as appears from the following quotation:

"Contrition, it is true, blots out sin, but who is ignorant, that to effect this it must be so intense, so ardent, so vehement, as to bear a proportion to the magnitude of the crimes

which it effaces? This is a degree of contrition which few reach, and hence, through perfect contrition alone, very few indeed could hope to obtain the pardon of their sins. It, therefore, became necessary that the Almighty, in His mercy, should afford a less precarious and less difficult means of reconciliation and of salvation; and this He has done, in His admirable wisdom, by giving to His Church the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. According to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, a doctrine firmly to be believed and professed by all her children, if the sinner have recourse to the tribunal of penance with a sincere sorrow for his sins, and a firm resolution of avoiding them in future, although he bring not with him that contrition which may be sufficient of itself to obtain the pardon of sin, his sins are forgiven by the minister of religion, through the power of the keys."

Here is "the abomination of desolation" in the temple of God. Here we are taught that though Christ has made perfect atonement for the sins of the whole world, yet no man is likely to get its benefits apart from a priest. There is no *perfect* contrition any more than there is perfect faith, or perfect love, or perfect obedience; hence no human being can be saved apart from a priest, al-

though Christ has died for him; though he has the Bible, has baptism, has holy communion, has every means of grace, he cannot be saved unless a man, it may be more sinful and ignorant than himself, lifts him up to the loving arms of Christ! Can any doctrine be more utterly opposed to the teaching of Christ and His apostles? Is our language one whit too strong when we call this teaching "the abomination of desolation"?

But our readers ask in amazement, is *this* the teaching of Dr. Ewer? Does he not say, "The use of the sacrament of absolution is not binding upon the Christian"? Yes, he *says* this, but contradicts his words again and again, as will appear from the following:

"For an equally assured remission of those sins that we commit after baptism, one of two things is *necessary*—namely, either perfect contrition or absolution."

But as all know there is no *perfect* contrition, salvation is impossible without priestly absolution. The same doctrine as that of Trent. Dr. Ewer says:

"In the sacrament of absolution this, their imperfect contrition, is accepted as though it were perfect."

The same doctrine as that of Trent, and almost in the same words. Dr. Ewer goes on:

"A hearty contrition each night after our daily self-examination, *if* we have full purpose to confess the sins of the day *in the sacrament of absolution* when next we go to that sacrament, insures instant and direct absolution from Heaven ere we sleep."

It will be seen, therefore, that this book teaches the same doctrine of priestly absolution that the Church of Rome does—nothing more and nothing less. Consider it for a moment. Christ has died for our sins; He offers us full and free pardon if we truly repent and believe His holy gospel. But we cannot get the benefit of this merciful promise unless some man intervene. He can lower the requirements of the gospel; he can make an imperfect contrition stand in place of the contrition of the gospel. He can make what is imperfect perfect in the sight of God. Here is a *man* professing to have the keys of David, who can open and no man can shut, and shut and no man can open. If this is not blasphemy, we know not what blasphemy is; if this is not destroying

the gospel, we fail to understand what destruction is. If Dr. Ewer is not a perverter of the gospel, then no man is.

We bring this false book before the Church. We arraign it as false to the teaching of the Bible; false to the teaching of the Episcopal Church; false to the teaching of every approved writer of our Church; false to the teaching of the Reformers; false to the doctrine which they sealed with their blood.

"THE CHRISTIAN PASSOVER."

It will be remembered that a few years ago the Archbishop of Canterbury, from his seat in "the House of Lords," affirmed (and his office and situation made him all the more careful as to what he said)—"He believed there was a conspiracy to unprotestantize the Church of England." We think it likely; and it would appear that the conspiracy has reached this country, if we consider that within a few weeks four little books have appeared in which the errors of Romanism are taught. "The Trinity Church Catechism" we have noticed; "The Grammar of Theology," by Dr. Ewer, has also been noticed; the next is the book whose title we have given above; and the last one we shall notice directly. What means this avalanche of such books, all printed by one house, if these men are not in collusion?

We may fail to awaken the Church to a sense of its danger; but our duty is to cry out, whether men will hear or whether they will not. We know it is said, and by such high authority as that of Mr. Gladstone, that the good sense of English-speaking peoples will not permit them to be led astray by such weak argumentation. Be it so. But there are not a few imaginative women and weak youths who *will* be led astray; and others of whom we might expect better things. Are not these souls precious enough to cause us to make honest effort to undo their work, to show they are men who understand neither what they say nor whereof they affirm? We feel the work they have undertaken, viz., to unprotestantize the Church, is impossible; but in the meantime they may do an incalculable amount of mischief.

The title of the book now before us is

"The Christian Passover; or, Notes on the Holy Communion. By the Editors of the Priest's Prayer-book." The "Priest's Prayer-book" is a publication which attracted no little attention in England by reason of its extreme views; from such a source, therefore, we could expect nothing but error; and this book, by these same editors, is so filled with it, there is nothing to be said but to take its *confession* of Romanism and ask if it be true, "what was the meaning of the English Reformation?"

There will be no difficulty in reviewing this tract, because it makes honest confession that its views of the holy communion are those that were held by the Church for fifteen hundred years; so, of course, held by the Roman Church. Here is what it says in its own words:

"And therefore it was not till a thousand years after our Lord's time that any Christian denied the real presence. [Here is the foot note we give in this connection.] All the ancient Churches are agreed on this head, however they may differ in other matters. The Greek Church and the Roman Catholic Church split asunder a thousand years ago, but teach the same doctrine of

the real presence. So does the Armenian Church, which parted from the Greek Church fourteen hundred years ago, and the Coptic, which separated at the same time. None of these borrow from another, so there is plain proof that this doctrine was that of the undivided Church fifteen hundred years ago, and must be that which the early fathers and the ancient liturgies teach as being the doctrine of the apostles. All other doctrines about the presence of Christ in the sacrament are new. [This is all of the note; we begin with the text where we left off.] What we are therefore bound as Christians to believe is that by the act of consecration and the power of the Holy Ghost, the bread and wine become the very true and real body and blood of Christ, present as really as when He walked upon earth, or as He is now in heaven, though in a different way."

There is no difficulty here. We have not to prove that this is Roman teaching, for it is honestly confessed. Nor will it be necessary to prove that this Roman doctrine is false; this having been done by *every* theologian of our Church a thousand times. Our duty is easier; and our first question is, "What was the need of the English Reformation?" The mere fact there was a pope is of no doctrinal significance; certainly not

at the time of the Reformation before he was decreed infallible. But the Reformation in England turned mainly upon the doctrine of "the real presence," and the consequent idolatry of the Mass, on the supposition there was no presence of Christ in the bread and wine. Here is where the battle of the Reformation was fought. Now, if this book gives the true doctrine of Christ, anybody can see the Reformation was a mistake. If, on the other hand, the Reformation was of God, then this little book is as false as can be.

Bearing on this point is the martyrdom of the Reformers; bishops, priests, and laymen. They were judged by the Roman ecclesiastical courts, and the trial turned upon this: "Do you believe in the real presence? If you do, well; if not, you go to the stake." And to the stake they went because they would not deny the truth of God and believe this presence of Christ in bread and wine, which ought to be worshipped. This matter is one of such importance that a short account of the official trials of some of these men will not be without interest. Here are the charges brought against Ridley and Latimer by the Roman ecclesiastical courts:

"We do object to thee, Nicholas Ridley, and to thee, Hugh Latimer, jointly and severally; first, that thou, Nicholas Ridley, in this high University of Oxford, A.D., 1554, in the months of April, May, June, July, or in some one or more of them, hast affirmed, and openly defended and maintained, and in many other times and places besides, that the true and natural body of Christ, after the consecration of the priest, is not really present in the sacrament of the altar.

"2. Item, that in the year and months aforesaid thou hast publicly affirmed and defended, that in the sacrament of the altar remaineth still the substance of bread and wine.

"3. Item, that in the said year and months thou hast openly affirmed, and obstinately maintained, that in the mass is no propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead."

Here is Ridley's answer in part to the first charge; that the natural body of Christ is *not* really present in the sacrament:

"I, being fully by God's word thereunto persuaded, confess Christ's natural body to be in the sacrament indeed by Spirit and grace, because that whosoever receiveth worthily that bread and wine, receiveth effectuously Christ's body and drinketh His blood, that is, he is made effectually partaker of His passion; and you make a grosser kind of

being, enclosing a natural, a lively, and a moving body, under the shape or form of bread and wine. Now, this difference considered, to the question thus I answer, that in the sacrament of the altar is the natural body and blood of Christ *vere et realiter*, indeed and really, for spiritually, by grace and efficacy; for so every worthy receiver receiveth the very true body of Christ. But if you mean really and indeed so that thereby you would include a lively and a movable body under the forms of bread and wine, then, in that sense, is not Christ's body in the sacrament really and indeed."

In regard to the second charge, that in the sacrament there remaineth the substance of bread and wine, Ridley says:

"The true substance and nature of bread and wine remaineth; with the which the body is in like sort nourished, as the soul is by grace and spirit with the body of Christ. Even so in baptism the body is washed with the visible water, and the soul is cleansed from all filth by the invisible Holy Ghost; and yet the water ceaseth not to be water, but keepeth the nature of water still; in like sort, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the bread ceaseth not to be bread."

This analogy between the bread of one sacrament and the water of the other, makes

Ridley's view clear as sunlight. No more change in the bread of the holy communion than in the water of baptism. And this is one great reason, we may say *the* one reason, why Ridley was burned at the stake; and yet what Ridley was burned for denying, this is what the book we are noticing affirms!

The answer of that true man of God and brave bishop, Hugh Latimer, is like that of Ridley's:

"In the sacrament the worthy receiver receiveth the very body of Christ, and drinketh his blood by the Spirit and grace; but after that *corporal* being which the Romish Church prescribeth, Christ's body and blood is not in the sacrament under the forms of bread and wine."

In regard to the mass being a sacrifice, Latimer says:

"Christ made one oblation and sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, and that a perfect sacrifice; neither needeth there to be any other, neither can there be any other, propitiatory."

We see, therefore, what these men were put to death for. If the book we are considering is true, these men were put to death for heresy. Were they? This is what this book

virtually says; but were they? We want to emphasize this question, were they? And was the Reformation one of the great blunders of the Christian Church? This we must believe if the teaching of this book be true.

Another matter bearing on the subject. The men that were put to death for not holding the doctrine of the "real presence," were the men that compiled the Book of Common Prayer; what must therefore be the teaching of this book? Did these men teach in this book the very doctrine they died for not believing? This is impossible. Hence it is evident that the Book of Common Prayer cannot teach a doctrine that its compilers died in opposition to. This needs no argument. It is plain, therefore, that the book we are commenting on is in opposition to the teaching of the Prayer-book; and yet these writers solemnly promised to teach no other doctrine than that of the Prayer-book.

There is another matter of some interest. For more than three hundred years all the divines of the Church of England have been discussing the doctrine of the holy communion; they have shown with a force of argument that has never been refuted, that the

Roman doctrine was neither the teaching of the Bible nor of the early Church. We take in hand, for instance, Jewel's work on this subject; his opponent in his hands is as an infant in the hands of a giant. He bids him give only *one* name of any Church father for six hundred years after Christ who even so much as used the words "real presence," and he would give up the argument; but not *one* such could be found. Therefore, when the author of this book affirms there was unanimity in the whole undivided Church about "real presence," he shows either an amount of ignorance or of assurance that is wonderful.

There is another matter worth considering; what is the use or benefit of a corporal presence of Christ in the bread and wine? Let us suppose it true; what is the good of it? On the supposition we eat Christ with our mouths and swallow Him into our stomachs, what of it? Is Christ any nearer our real selves? Any nearer our hearts? Any nearer our characters? Would any person be the holier, or the wiser, or the better because Christ was in his stomach? Of all senseless as well as silly and useless notions this is the

most. You are asked to believe a doctrine which, if it were true, would do no possible good. For this kind of reception of Christ into our stomachs (and by the acknowledgment of all Romanists He enters the mouth and stomach of a wicked man as much as in the mouth of the holiest), this kind of reception of Christ is perfectly consistent with His entrance into the mouth and stomach of a mouse or any other animal. And this was a favorite argument with the English Church writers; and it is one that could not be answered. Some Romanists said it did, and some —they could not say whether it did or not; but there can be but one answer; a presence of Christ in the bread, that can be eaten by infidels, can be eaten by animals. To such a degradation do these men bring the holy sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. Talk about the profanation of this sacrament; is there any greater than that a mouse can eat the body of Christ in the holy supper of our blessed and glorious Redeemer?

We have shown by the confession of this book that what it teaches is the doctrine of the Church of Rome; and if this be its teaching, then it is the teaching of all the

other books published by these conspirators. And shall *we* receive such teaching, which, rather than do, our Reformers preferred to die a cruel death? Shall our martyrs be accounted as heretics? Shall their names be cast out as wicked and profane? This we *must* do if the teaching of this "Christian Passover" be in accordance with God's word.

"HELPS TO MEDITATION."

The last of the four books we propose to notice is entitled "HELPS TO MEDITATION. Sketches for every day in the year. Part II. From the Epiphany to Septuagesima. Fifty-one sketches. By the Rev. Alfred G. Mortimer."

We need hardly say there is good in it. If it were all evil it would do no harm; but because there is mixture of evil with good, its tendency is to do more harm than good.

The same Romish doctrines are taught in this as in the other books, only there is vein of such absurdity in it, that in reading we are not far removed from grotesqueness; and if it were not about sacred things, not far removed from laughter.

We give specimens of its teachings; being the same as those of Rome. "Make acts of faith and love in the Church as your mother's home; adoré our blessed Lord, beneath the humble veils of bread and wine, present in the holy eucharist; pray for simplicity, hiddenness, detachment, endurance, and generosity." We are at loss to understand the meaning of "your mother's home." Knowing the guile of these men, we are of opinion it means that the Virgin Mary is our mother; and it will not be long before they have the worship of the Virgin, as they now have the idolatry of the Mass. This latter is here; as we are bidden to *adore* our blessed Lord beneath the humble veils of bread and wine. This is what our Church writers have been in the habit of calling "the idolatry of the Mass." And yet, with apparent reverence for this sacrament, there is strange familiarity—Mr. Mortimer calling it the "H. E." Nor is this matter for wonder; even the heathen are superstitious as they are irreverent.

This book gives "the three theological virtues;" "the three notable duties;" "mortal sins and venial sins;" and *opus operatum* as

in the Roman Catechisms. We have "the gift of peace in absolution;" and "the holy eucharist is a propitiatory sacrifice for all for whom we offer it." This is affirmed, though Article 31 says: "The sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt, were *blasphemous* fables." From these it is evident that the teaching of this book is the same as that of the other books we have been noticing. But we must quote the grotesque notions with which this book is filled.

We notice strange language such as no *Church* writer ever used; "make acts of faith, of love, of hope, of honor, of self-oblation." What this means savors of Pelagianism; and as there is much of this heresy in the Church of Rome, we may expect it in their imitators.

"Jesus may be lost to the soul by an act of mortal sin; also by long indulgence in venial sin; a *habit* of venial sins is quite inconsistent with love of Christ." We can indulge in venial sins up to the point of not allowing them to form a habit; up to this point they would seem of little consequence.

But what are *venial* and what are *mortal*

sins is a question which no theologian can answer. The tendency of the very division is to raise difficulties and cause some sins to appear trifles.

Here is an extract which seems ridiculous:

"Pray that in our eucharists we may not only feed on our Lord, but learn of Him. There is a close parallel between our Lord's life at Nazareth and His presence in the H. E. Consider how in the H. E. our Lord observes now the same laws that he taught in His hidden life at Nazareth. First simplicity: no means of manifesting Himself to the eye of man, and yet accomplishing such results in man. . . . He is the bread of life, the principle of life, and yet in the H. E., contented to be deprived of the exhibition of this life; always working for us, and yet always resting in the quiet calm of the sacramental species. Poverty: His poverty in the H. E. seems almost to exceed that of Nazareth, present there under the humble forms of bread and wine, the common elements of daily food. Obedience: As at Nazareth He obeyed SS. Joseph and Mary, so now He is obedient to the words spoken by the lips of his priests, to the wishes of His communicants; helpless as a little child, in the H. E. He appeals to the devotion and care of those he loves, but who, alas, often love not Him."

Did any man ever read such nonsense? The Lord of Glory "contented to be deprived of the exhibition of His life and resting in the quiet calm of the sacramental species!" A Christ as "helpless as a little child," is not the Christ of the Bible, to whom all power in heaven and earth has been given. Who wants a helpless Christ? As soon as a man becomes a Romanizer he takes leave of whatever common sense he had. When PALEY spoke of the *overturn* of the dogma of transubstantiation, he said it took away a load from the Church that would sink it. But here is the same dogma brought back, with an amount of foolishness combined with it, that makes the Christian religion ridiculous.

Ridiculous as this is, read the following:

"The sleep of Jesus in the ship was at once the cause of the storm and the refuge in it, so now, it is the presence of our Lord in the H. E. that provokes the attack of the world; give up that, and the storm ceaseth; but the presence of Jesus is also our refuge in the storm."

This is the strangest thing we have read for many a day. Ah! Mr. Mortimer, when

the Reformers of blessed memory *gave up* this falsity, the storm, so far from ceasing, raged more furiously. *Your* brethren of the Church of Rome burned at the stake men, women and children—*our* brethren—because they gave up *this* presence. With what pathos did Bishop Jewel tell how they burned one of our sisters who drew near the time of her delivery; whilst at the stake the pains of childbirth came upon her; and the precious babe of which she was delivered they threw into the fire with her! This is the same doctrine of transubstantiation you and your brothers of Rome are bringing into the Church, which *they* died to throw out. Shame upon you and all like you!

"The peace of heaven at last will be but the awakening of Jesus from his long sacramental sleep, to end the warfare with the peace of eternity. At Nazareth He was abandoned by the world He came to save; it threatened Him with death when He crossed its path, and treated Him with neglect when He withdrew from it. So in the H. E., a few faithful ones adore, but the majority pass Him by. See an average congregation on a communion Sunday, why are they all hurrying out in the midst of the service? What has happened? *Jesus is coming*, and

they wish to get away from Him. Go into that Church at the early celebration; the morning is cold, the majority love their own comfort better than Jesus, and so leave Him to come and go, unwelcomed and unthanked."

This extraordinary bit of foolishness hardly needs comment; but a few words: "Jesus is coming;" the conclusion is evident; He was not there. Then what business had a Christian congregation in a building where Christ was not present? No Christ in the Church, though Christ said that wherever two or three are gathered together in His name, there He is in the midst of them. But Mr. Mortimer will say this was not his meaning. Very well; then Christ *was* in the assembly of His people. Was he any *more* there after the act of consecration? Was He not there in His almighty power and grace? "There in a different way." But it matters not how Christ is present, or in what way; unless there be *faith* on the part of the congregation they will receive no good from Christ. But this crude, this artificial presence of Christ which comes at the beck of a priest, is something which no soul of man can get good from; if he gets good, it is by His spiritual and not by His bodily presence.

One more bit of foolishness and we conclude. Mr. Mortimer, commenting on our Lord's words, "Wheresoever the carcass is there will the eagles be gathered together," remarks: "The text *positively* asserts without limitation that wheresoever the body is the eagles will be gathered together, therefore the text is a test of the eagles in the parish; if we have eagle sight to discern the body of Jesus in the H. E. we shall act on this text, and be attracted to the H. E." But the people who go to Church to get the natural body of Christ on the communion table, and which they eat with their mouths, are *jays;* so Chrysostom calls them. We will let St. Augustine interpret the verse, "Where as the carcass shall be, thither shall the eagles resort together; that is to say, *into heaven; thither* shall the eagles resort together; this is spoken of the spiritual, faithful men, following His passion and humility, be filled as it were with His body." So instead of this text (interpreted by Mr. Mortimer) being a test whereby we may discern the eagles in a parish; according to Augustine it would be the way to discover the *jay birds.* But whoso in a parish resorteth

to the holy communion to lift up his heart to find Christ in *heaven*, those are "the eagles."

We have said enough about this book; not only Romish, but silly as well.

Here are four books by ministers of the Protestant Church of England and of the United States. They all teach, more or less grossly, the doctrines for which our Reformers died at the stake rather than believe. The reader is now able to understand them. What does he think ought to be done? Is he going to fold his hands and say, "Oh! it is nothing; I cannot help it; after a while they will become wiser." But the apostle bid us contend earnestly for the faith once [for all] delivered. Will we be silent? or will we contend for the faith?